46TH CONGRESS, 2d Session. } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. { MIS. DOC. No. 20.

# WOMAN SUFFRAGE.—ARGUMENTS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

FEBRUARY 3, 1880.—Recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 24, 1880.

The CHAIRMAN pro tem. (Mr. HARRIS, of Virginia): The order of business for the present session of the committee is the delivery of arguments by delegates to the Woman Suffrage Convention now holding its sessions in Washington. I am informed that the delegates are in attendance upon the committee. We will be pleased to hear them.

A list of the names of the ladies proposing to speak, with a memorandum of the limit of time allotted to each, has been handed to me for my guidance; and, in the absence of the chairman, (Mr. KNOTT), it will be my duty to confine the speakers to the number of minutes apportioned to them respectively upon the paper before me. As an additional consideration for adhering to the regulation as to time, I will mention that members of the committee have informed me that, having made engagements to be at the departments and elsewhere on business appointments during the day, they will be compelled to leave the committee-room upon the expiration of the time assigned for the present order of business.

The first name upon the list is that of Mrs. Emma Mont. McRae, of Indiana, to whom five minutes are allowed.

## REMARKS OF MRS. EMMA MONT. MCRAE, OF INDIANA.

Mrs. MCRAE (who was introduced by Miss Susan B. Anthony, as the principal of the high school at Muncie, Ind.) occupied five minutes. She said:

*Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee:* The women in the State of Indiana who want to vote doubtless number many more than you imagine upon hearing the name of the Hoosier State. In Indiana the cause of woman has made marked advancement, and there women have advantages over their sex in other States. At the same time we realize—and as mothers especially we realize it—that we need the right to vote, in order that we may have protection. We need that right as one indispensably necessary to our security in the enjoyment of other rights. We need the ballot because through the medium of its power alone we can hope to wield that influence, in the making of laws affecting our own and our children's interests, to which we claim to be entitled. Therefore, I have come from the State of Indiana to give utterance to the voice of the mothers among the women of that State, in behalf of their petition for the right to vote.

Some recent occurrences in Indiana, one in particular in the section of the State from which I come, have impressed us more sensibly than we were ever before impressed with the necessity to us of the exercise of this right. We want to vote that we may be permitted to earn our bread. The particular incident to which I refer was this: In the town

JK
1885
:W66
13809



of Muncie, Indiana, from which I come, a young girl, of some twenty-one years, who for the past five years had been employed as a clerk in the post-office, and upon whom a widowed mother was dependent for support, was told, on the first of January, that she was no longer needed in the office. She had filled her place well; no complaint had been made against her, and it was not intimated that her place was a supernumerary one. She very modestly asked the postmaster as to the cause of her discharge, and he replied: "We have a man who has done work for the party, and we must give that man a place; I haven't room for both of you. I must take your place away from you and give it to that man." Now, there you have at once the reason why we want the ballot; we want to be able to do something for the party in a substantial way, so that men may not have this to tell us, that they have no room for us because we do nothing "*for the party.*" I want this young girl, and all the young girls, and all the mothers in Indiana, to be able to do something for "the party" in Indiana, by means of which they can show they have the power to protect themselves in earning livelihoods. When they have the ballot, women will work for "the party," as a means of enabling them to hold places in which they may get bread for their mothers and for their children, if necessity requires this of them.

[Here the five minutes expired.]

### REMARKS OF MISS JESSIE T. WAITE, OF ILLINOIS.

Miss WAITE was awarded the next five minutes. She said.

*Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives:* I feel called upon to say that, previous to this time, the women of Illinois have not been ready for the ballot, but that now they are. In that State we have attained to almost every right except that of the ballot. We have been admitted to all the schools and colleges; we have become accustomed to parliamentary usages; we have become accustomed to voting in literary societies and in all matters connected with the interests of the colleges and schools; we are considered members in good standing of the associations, and, in some cases, the young ladies in the institutes have been told that they hold the balance of power.

The same reason for woman suffrage that has been given by the delegate from Indiana (Mrs. McRae) holds good with reference to the State of Illinois, that women must have the ballot in order that they may have the means of self-support and protection in getting bread for themselves and their families by giving to the party that looks for their support some substantial evidence of their strength. There are evidences of an uprising among the women of our State, and of the development among them of this feeling that they must have the ballot. Experience has demonstrated, especially in the temperance movement, how fruitless are all their efforts while the ballot is withheld from their hands. They have prayed; they have petitioned; they have talked; they have lectured; they have done all that they could do, except to vote; and yet all availeth them nothing. Miss Frances Willard and other ladies presented to the legislature of Illinois a petition of such length that it would have reached around this room. It contained over 50,000 signatures.

Miss SUSAN B. ANTHONY (aside). One hundred and eighty thousand.

Miss WAITE (continuing.) I am obliged for the correction. One hundred and eighty thousand. I was not aware that it contained so many names, though I did learn that the number of signatures was largely increased over 50,000. The purpose of the petition was to have the

legislature give the women of the State the right to vote upon the question of license or no license, in their respective districts.

I have found, since coming to the East, that the women of the West have reason to congratulate themselves upon their comparatively advanced position. They may, indeed, flatter themselves upon the truth of the remark of Bishop Berkeley, of California, as applied to the condition of women in the State of Illinois, when he said that "Westward the star of empire takes its way." This is manifest in all our schools, and in all the avennes of employment which have been opened to women in that State, within the past five or ten years. There remains, therefore, only this one great deprivation, the denial of the suffrage; as, except upon school district matters (in which particular the right has also been extended to women in some of the Eastern States), we have not been allowed to vote. In some of the counties of our State we have ladies as superintendents of schools, and one or two who are professors in colleges. One of the professors in the Industrial University at Champaign is a lady. Throughout the State you may find ladies who excel in every branch of study and in every trade. It was a lady who took the prize at "the Exposition" for the most beautiful piece of cabinet-work. This is said to have been a marvel of beauty, and extraordinary as a specimen of fine art. She was a foreigner; a Scandinavian, I believe. Another lady is a teacher of wood-carving, a branch of industry which is becoming quite an art. There are lady physicians. There are two lady attorneys, Perry and Martin, now practicing in the city of Chicago. Representatives of our sex are also to be found among real estate agents and journalists; while, in one or two instances, as preachers, they have been recognized and authorized to say what they felt called upon to say in the churches.

[Here the five minutes expired.]

## REMARKS OF MRS. CATHERINE A. STEBBINS, OF MICHIGAN.

Mrs. STEBBINS was given the next five minutes. She said:

"Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay!" So said the poet; and I say, Better a week with these inspired women in conference than years of an indifferent conventional society! Their presence has been a blessing to the people of this District, and will prove in the future a blessing to our government. These women, from all sections of our country, with a moral and spiritual enthusiasm (enthusiasm, God in us) which seeks to lift off the moral burdens of our government and social life, come to you, telling of the obstacles and barriers that have beset their path and baffled them in their strivings. They have tried to heal the hurts of the stricken in vice, ignorance, and despair; to save our land from self-destruction and disintegration. One has sought to reform the drunkard, to save the moderate drinker, to convert the liquor-seller; another, to shelter the homeless; another, to lift and save the abandoned woman. "Abandoned?" once asked a prophet-like man of our time, who added, "There never was an abandoned woman without an abandoned man!" Abandoned of whom? let us ask. Surely not by the merciful Father. No; neither man nor woman is ever abandoned by Him, and He sends His instruments, in the persons of some of these great-hearted women, to appeal to you to restore their God-given freedom of action, that "the least of these" may be remembered.

But in our councils no one has dwelt upon *one* of the great evils of our civilization, the scourge of war; though it has been said that women

will fight. It is true, there are instances in which they have considered it a duty; there were such in the rebellion. But the majority of women would not declare war, would not enlist soldiers, and would not vote supplies and equipments, because many of the most thoughtful believe there *is* a better way, and that women can bring a moral power to bear that shall make war needless.

Jeannette, in the old song, appeals to her lover, Jennot:

"If kings will show their might,
Why, let those who make the quarrels
Be the only men to fight."

Like my father and mother, I was reared in the society of "Friends," and we loved the principles of peace, of non resistance of injuries. The rebellion came; a brother in New York City enlisted in the Army in April, '61. We had come to think, because we hoped, that men in our country had outgrown the spirit of war on the battle-field, although we perceived that if men would not repent and make clean our government, it might prove inevitable. Brother wrote us that he had enlisted and must go. We were overwhelmed with grief at the thought, but the act was done; we could only submit. I well remember what I wrote him; painful as it was, I must *once* write it. The thought, I told him, that he was to deliberately stand in the ranks to be aimed at and shot down was a terrible one and a great fear to us; but the other thought, that he was as deliberately to stand up and aim his weapon at another man, and perhaps take his life, was a far more terrible thought; and let me say here, that if men could see and know the lives they take, they would shrink, in many cases utterly shrink, from war. They do not see the individual men. Modern warfare is very different from the old. Men seldom fight hand to hand, and the smoke of battle hides their deeds from sight. The soldiers tell us—whole regiments, I think—that they never saw a man fall who was hit by their individual bullets. O, what a solace to their sensitive hearts!—not to their consciences, for they start out to serve their country. The human heart of man, under the best conditions and under the tender guidance of a conscientious mother, revolts at such deeds.

In passing, let me speak of a reply this brother made to our blessed mother after she had warned him against the temptations of the great city. He wrote, "Never fear for me, dear mother, in regard to these temptations; I have not the least inclination to the vices of the low, for I have had too good a start at home." O, comforting, enduring words! They live in memory of a mother's faithfulness and a son's truth. And here we see the close connection with deeper questions of the mother's influence, which we have no time to discuss to-day.

But let us take one picture, representative of the general features of war—we say nothing of our convictions in regard to the conflict. Ulysses S. Grant or Anna Ella Carroll make plans and maps for the campaign; McClellan and Meade are commanded to collect the columbiads, muskets and ammunition, and move their men to the attack. At the same time the saintly Clara Barton collects her cordials, medicines, and delicacies, her lint and bandages and, putting them in the ambulance assigned, joins the same moving train. McClellan's men meet the enemy and men—brothers—on both sides, fall by the death-dealing missiles. Miss Barton and her aids bear off the sufferers, staunch their bleeding wounds, soothe the reeling brain, bandage the crippled limbs, pour in the oil and wine, and make as easy as may be the soldier's bed. What a solemn and heart-rending farce is here enacted! And yet in our present development, men and women seek to

reconcile it with the requirements of religion and the necessities of our conflicting lives. So few recognize the absolute truth!

But mothers know the cost of a life. One of the sweetest and most self-sacrificing women who ever did works of mercy in this District and one of the most serious who ever appeared before your committee, in conversation with me about the faith, love, and suffering of women, said, "In maternity every mother goes down into the garden of Gethsemane and leans her heart on the heart of God." Another has said, "Every mother is a Madonna by the cradle of her first-born." Will you help us to save our first born?

[Here the time expired.]

REMARKS OF MRS. ELIZABETH L. SAXON, OF LOUISIANA.

Mrs. SAXON (to whom was allotted five minutes) said:

*Gentlemen of the Committee:* I feel that I would much prefer leaving my time to Miss Anthony but having been called upon as one of three members here present from the south—coming, as I do, from the State of Louisiana—it may be incumbent upon me to state why I am here.

It is said that the emancipation proclamation was a military necessity; that the political privilege to the negro was a political necessity. I entered upon the enfranchisement of women as a moral necessity. We who are mothers have gathered here from all quarters of the land, because we want to be able to help our children—helping, through our children, all mankind.

In the course of conversation with one or two of the gentlemen here, I made to them the statement that our people are not as unfavorable to this movement as they think, and I will, as briefly as possible, give the authority for my statement. In July last, during the session of the constitutional convention of Louisiana, I presented to that body a petition on this subject signed by the very best men in the city of New Orleans and elsewhere. We had the names of five clergymen and seven of the most prominent physicians of the State. Dr. Richardson, a leading physician, said to his wife afterwards, "I reproach you for not standing by these ladies in their effort for the emancipation of women." Governor Wiltz, who occupied the chair of the convention (being at that time lieutenant governor), heartily approved our petition. We also presented a supplementary petition, which, with the first, was referred to the judiciary committee. We were formally invited by Mr. Poché, a prominent Creole from one of the upper parishes and a member of the committee on the elective franchise, to appear before the judiciary committee, which was then meeting in the St. Charles Hotel. They set apart an evening for our accommodation and permitted the attendance of any other ladies who desired to attend. The ladies, not being accustomed to appear before public bodies, being timid and reserved, as all Southern ladies are, declined to take part with me in the presentation of the subject. However, I went before the judiciary committee attended by Col. John D. Sandige, and made my argument before them. That committee, having upon it some Republican members but composed largely of Democrats, heard me so favorably that they reported affirmatively an ordinance on the subject to the convention. Subsequently, I appeared before the convention in company with other ladies, among whom were Mrs. Merrick, the wife of the chief justice of the State; and Mrs. Dr. Keating (niece of Mrs. Dr. Clemence Lozier, of New York,) a lady who had some of the first families of the State under her care as a physician, and who, though her pecuniary in-

terests were in a way to be sacrificed, was governed solely by her sense of right, and did not hesitate to go with me before the convention and make her plea for woman—which I do not think many men would have done. Mrs. Dorsey, who left to Jefferson Davis her fortune, and who was then on her death-bed—than whom no woman ever ranked higher socially, intellectually, or in any way—was among the signers to the petition which we presented. She wrote a letter on this subject, which was read to the convention by Colonel Sandige, and the occasion of that formal letter was the last upon which she ever handled a pen. In our appeal to that convention we plead as mothers, and our plea was, "We do not want men's places; we only want you, gentlemen, to help us in school reforms, in prison reforms, and social reforms."

I would mention, in this connection, the very pertinent retort made by the delegate now here from Delaware, from whom I learned of it last evening. Upon being told by a gentleman prominent in public life that he favored woman suffrage, but that men were opposed to women going to the polls, she replied, that when there was a foul place about a house, a cess-pool, or anything of the kind, it was the women who went to work to carbolize and scour it up and, as they did this in private life, they would prove equally efficient in scouring up the foul places in public life.

Yesterday, before the Senate Judiciary Committee, I heard Miss Anthony make an argument that, to my mind, was indisputable. I have no doubt that every one who heard it will agree with me in that. Those who now come before you, gentlemen, are pleading with you to help us women to do that which is emphatically our own work. They want nothing more. The character of the ladies who worked with me in this cause in Louisiana was a sufficient guarantee to those who appended their names to our petition that it was not the riff-raff of society who were asking for recognition but the mothers of a community; and let me tell you, gentlemen, that whenever the moral forces of a nation are to be aroused, as those of our nation are fast becoming aroused, the most effective agents that can be employed in the work are the mothers. We want to go into the institutions of learning, and make reforms there. We want to go into prisons, and make prison reforms. Wherever woman sins and suffers, there let woman go. The ranks of iniquity, gentlemen, are not recruited from a foreign race, but from the babes born of our bodies and nursed in our arms, and every woman who has gone down to ruin has gone down with a broken-hearted mother behind her. I plead for those, gentlemen———

[Here the five minutes expired.]

### REMARKS OF MRS. LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE, OF NEW YORK.

Mrs. BLAKE (to whom ten minutes had been assigned) came forward, bearing a volume of the Revised Statutes, and said:

*Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee:* I come here with your own laws in my hands, and the volume is quite a heavy one too, to ask you something about our position to day. I ask you whether we, women, are citizens of this nation?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Harris, of Virginia, in the chair). I have only to say to you, madam, in reply, that the committee are here to listen, not to advise.

Mrs. BLAKE. Then I will proceed to instruct you, if I may be permitted to instruct so august a body as this.

I have here the book of laws which you, men, have made. I find in this book, under the heading of the chapter on "Citizenship," the following:

"SEC. 1992. All persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are declared to be citizens of the United States."

I suppose that you, gentlemen, will admit that we, women, are, in the language of the section, "persons," and that we cannot reasonably be included in the class spoken of as "Indians not taxed." Therefore I claim that we are "citizens."

The same chapter also contains the following:

"SEC. 1994. Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States and who might herself be lawfully naturalized shall be deemed a citizen."

Under this section also we are *citizens*. I am myself, as indeed are most of the ladies present, married to a citizen of the United States; so that we are citizens under this count if we were not citizens before.

Then, further, in the legislation known as "The Civil Rights Bill," I find this language:

"All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishments, pains, penalties," and so forth.

One would think that the logical conclusion from that which I have last read would be that *all citizens* are entitled to equal protection everywhere. It appears to mean that.

Then I turn to another piece of legislation—that which is known as "The Enforcement Act"—one which some of you, gentlemen, did not like very much when it was enacted—and there I find another declaration on the same question. The act is entitled "An act to enforce the right of citizens of the United States to vote in the several States of this Union and for other purposes." The right of "*citizens*" to vote appears to be conceded by this act. In the 2d section, the act says:

"It shall be the duty of every such person and officer to give to all citizens of the United States the same and equal opportunity to perform such prerequisite, and to become qualified to vote, without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

I ask you, gentlemen of the committee, as lawyers, whether you do not think that, after we have been declared to be citizens, we have the right to claim the protection of this enforcement act? Is it not clear to you that the gentlemen have made the most singular muddle—I don't wish to seem disrespectful—but is it not the fact, that they have made the most singular muddle in the present condition of woman in this country? We are practically remanded to a sort of intermediate condition, although we have been declared to be citizens by the laws of the United States. When you, gentlemen from the North, rise in your places here in the halls of Congress and make these walls ring with your eloquence, you are prone to talk a great deal about the right of every United States citizen to the ballot, and the necessity of protecting every such citizen in its exercise. What do you mean by it?

It occurs to me here to call your attention to a matter of recent occurrence. As you know, there has been a little unpleasantness in Maine—a State which is not without a representative among the members of the Judiciary Committee—and certain gentlemen there, especially Mr. Blaine, have been greatly exercised in their minds because, as they allege, the people of Maine have not been permitted to express their will at the polls. Why, gentlemen, I assert that a majority of the

people of Maine have never been permitted to express their will at the polls. A majority of the people of Maine are women, and, from the foundation of this government to this day, have never been permitted to exercise any of the inalienable rights of citizens. Mr. Blaine made a speech a day or two ago in Augusta. He began by reciting the condition of affairs, owing to the effort, as he states, "to substitute a false count for an honest ballot," and congratulated his audience upon the instrumentalities by which they had triumphed—"without firing a gun, without shedding a drop of blood, without striking a single blow, without one disorderly assemblage. *The people* have regained their own right through the might and majesty of their own laws." He goes on in this vein to speak of those whom he calls "the people of Maine." Well, gentlemen, I do not think you will deny that *women are people.* It appears to me that what Mr. Blaine said in that connection was nonsense, unless indeed he forgot that there were any others than men among the people of the State of Maine. I don't suppose that you, gentlemen, are often so forgetful. Mr. Blaine said further, "The Republicans of Maine and throughout the land felt that they were not merely fighting the battle of a single year, but for all the future of the State; not merely fighting the battle of our own State alone, but for all the States that are attempting the great problem of State government throughout the world. The corruption or destruction of the ballot is a crime against free government, and when successful is a subversion of free government." Does that mean the ballot *for men only* or the ballot *for the people*, men and women too? If it is to be received as meaning anything, it ought to mean not for one sex alone, but for both.

Mr. Lincoln declared, in one of his noblest utterances, that no man was good enough to govern another man without that man's consent. Of course he meant it in its broadest terms; he meant that no man or woman was good enough to govern another man or woman without that other man's or woman's consent.

I need not recall to you, gentlemen, the old fundamental principles of this republic, that "taxation without representation is tyranny," "that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." You learned those lessons when boys at school; and remember, gentlemen, we learned them when little girls at school also. We love our liberties just as dearly as you love yours, and we do not like to be disfranchized any more than you would like it. What gentleman here would consent to give up his right to vote—I will not say his right to hold office—and yet you expect us, women, some of us as old as yourselves, and some of us your seniors, to be content with our disfranchised condition.

Mr. Blaine, on another occasion, in connection with the same subject-matter, had much to say of the enormity of the oppression practiced by his political opponents in depriving the town of Portland of the right of representation in view of its paying such heavy taxes as it does pay. He expressed the greatest indignation at the attempt, forgetting utterly that great, that enormous, body of women who pay taxes and who are perpetually deprived of the right of representation.

In this connection it may be pertinent for me to express the hope, by way of a suggestion to you, gentlemen, that hereafter, when making your speeches, you will not use the term "citizens" in a broad, general sense unless you mean to include women as well as men, and that when you do not mean to include women you will speak of male citizens as a distinct and separate class, because the term, in its general application, is illogical and its meaning obscure if not self-contradictory.

Mr. Hayes, our amiable president, was so pleased with one of the sentences in the message put out by him a year ago that, in his message of this year, he has reiterated the same sentence, repeating it in precisely identical language. The sentence reads thus: "That no temporary or administrative interests of government will ever displace the zeal of our people in defense of the primary rights of citizenship, and that the power of public opinion will override all political prejudices and all sectional and State attachments in demanding that all over our wide territory the name and character of citizen of the United States shall mean one and the same thing, and carry with them unchallenged security and respect." Let me suggest what he ought to have said unless he intended to include women, although I am afraid that Mr. Hayes, when he wrote this, forgot that there were women in the United States, notwithstanding that his excellent wife, perhaps, stood by his side. He ought to have said: "An act having been passed to enforce the rights of *male* citizens to vote, the true vigor of *half* the population is thus expressed, and no interests of government will ever displace the zeal of *half* of our people in defense of the primary rights of *our male* citizens. *The prosperity of the States depends upon the protection afforded to our male citizens;* and the name and character of male citizens of the United States shall mean one and the same thing and carry with them unchallenged security and respect" If Mr. Hayes had thus expressed himself, he would have made a perfectly logical and clear statement. Gentlemen, I hope that hereafter, when speaking or voting in behalf of the citizens of the United States, you will bear this in mind and will remember that women are citizens as well as men, and that they claim the same rights.

Gentlemen, this question of woman suffrage cannot much longer be ignored by you. In the State from which I come, although we had not last fall a right to vote, we are confident that the influence which we, as women, brought to bear in determining the result of the election at that time had something to do with sending into retirement a Democratic governor who was opposed to our reform, and electing a Republican governor who was in favor of it. Recollect, gentlemen, that the expenditure of time and money which has been made in this cause will not be without its effect. The time is coming when the demand of an immense number of the women of this country cannot be ignored. When you see these representatives coming up here from all the States of the Union to ask for this right, can you doubt that, some day, they will succeed in their mission? We do not stand before you to plead as beggars; we ask for that for which we do ask as our right. We ask it as due to the memory of our ancestors, who fought for the freedom of this country just as bravely as did yours. We ask it on many considerations. Why, gentlemen, the very furniture here, the carpet on this floor, was paid for with our money. We are taxed equally with the men to contribute to defray the expenses of this Congress, and we have a right equally with them to participate in the government.

In closing, I have only to ask, Is there no man here present who appreciates the emergencies of this hour? Is there no one among you who will rise up, on the floor of Congress, as the champion of this unrepresented half of the people of the United States? If so, the time is not far distant when there will be. The time is not far distant when we shall have our liberties, and the politician who can now understand the political importance of our cause, the statesman who can now see, and will now appreciate, the justice of it, that man, if true to himself, will write his name high on the scroll of fame beside those of the men who have been

the saviors of this country. Gentlemen, I entreat you not to let this hearing go by without giving due weight to all that we have said. I ask you to carry it in your hearts. We shall be successful in a few years. You can no more stay the onward current of this reform than you can fight against the stars in their courses.

Mr. WILLITS, of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a suggestion here. The regulation amendment, as it has heretofore been submitted, provided that the right of citizens of the United States to vote should not be abridged on account of sex. I notice that the amendment which the ladies here now propose has prefixed to it this phrase: "The right of suffrage in the United States shall be based on citizenship." I call attention to this, because I would like to have them explain as fully as they may why they incorporate the phrase, "shall be based on citizenship." Is the meaning this, that all citizens shall have the right to vote, or simply that citizenship shall be the basis of suffrage? The words "or for any reason not applicable to all citizens of the United States," also seem to require explanation. The proposition, in the form in which it is now submitted, I understand, covers a little more than has been covered by the amendment submitted in previous years.

Mrs. SARA A. SPENCER, of Washington, D. C. If the committee will permit me, I will say that the amendment, in its present form, is the concentrated wish of the women of the United States. The women of the country sent to Congress petitions, asking for three different forms of constitutional amendment and, when preparing the form of amendment now before the committee, I concentrated these three forms in the one before you (identical with that of the resolution offered in the House by Hon. George B. Loring and by Hon. T. W. Ferry in the Senate), omitting at the request of each of the three classes of petitioners, all phrases which were regarded by any of them as objectionable. The amendment, as now presented, is therefore the combined wish of the women of the country, viz, that citizenship in the United States shall mean suffrage, and that no one shall be deprived of the right to vote for reasons not equally applicable to all citizens.

### REMARKS OF MRS. MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, OF NEW YORK.

Mrs. Gage, the next speaker, was given thirty minutes.

She said:

*Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee:*

It is upon this point of the centralization of the suffrage power in the hands of the United States that I propose to speak. I will endeavor to show you that, in the progress of our government, from its very inception, liberty has been defended and has increased as certain power has been centralized in the hands of the general government, and taken away from the States. It will be borne in mind that at the beginning of their rebellion against Great Britain, each of the colonies had its individual grievance, and that at an early day, long anterior to the proclamation of our Declaration of Independence, it was deemed best for the colonies to unite.

Our first American Congress, which met in 1765, was fearful that the divers injuries under which the colonies suffered, and the many different charters under which they were governed might ensnare them—such was the language made use of by that Congress—"might ensnare them" into working in opposite directions. In this the Congress represented the popular sentiment, which found expression in various ways.

In the same year in which that body first convened, The Constitutional Courant, a paper published in the city of New York, came out with a significant representation of a serpent surrounded by thirteen stars and, encircling the whole, an inscription reading "Join, or die!" This inscription was at once adopted by the colonists as their motto; the announcement of it flew like wildfire over the whole thirteen colonies; the people began to be united in sentiment, and to realize that only by banding together in one compact whole could they hope to make their separate forces effective against the tyranny of Great Britain. It followed that, prior to our Declaration of Independence, eleven of the colonies, and a portion of one of the two remaining, united in certain articles of association. Indeed, that is the day to which we ought to look back as that of the birth of our nation, instead of that of 1776; for at that day, although formally adhering to their allegiance to Great Britain and to His Majesty George III, they united together and thenceforth acted as one body in regard to non-importation, non-exportation, and non-consumption, and practically became one people. Some nine years after The Constitutional Courant had put forth the motto of *join or die*, the first American Congress gave expression to the popular sentiment in declaring its apprehension that "the diverse interests" of the American colonies would "ensnare them" to keep themselves separate from each other. In 1776, with the proclamation of our Declaration of Independence, our country came before the world as an independent nation and one possessed of all the rights of a nation.

The importance of the necessity of a greater centralization of political power in the hands of the general government became manifest within a brief period after that proclamation had been made, as certain States asserted the right of an individual State to make peace, declare war, and contract alliances. Articles of confederation, having for their object the consolidation of certain powers in the general government with a view to promoting the security and ensuring the liberty of all the people, were entered into by the States. In 1782, after much discussion, originated upon a proposition in Congress to levy certain tariff duties and imposts—the State of Rhode Island, advocating what is now known as "the State rights' view, and protesting against the proposition through her Representative, the Speaker of the lower house, Hon. William Bradford—it was recommended by Congress that the States should confer greater power upon the general government. This recommendation was acquiesced in by only four of the thirteen colonies. The discussion, however, continued. It was then declared that the rights for which this nation contended were the rights of humanity. In the same year in which Rhode Island made her protest, the State of New York, from which I come, formally submitted a proposition for a general convention of the people to pass upon the question. This failed to ensure definite action. Finally, in 1786, the house of delegates of Virginia, passed a resolution inviting the assembling of commissioners from the various States, to discuss the question and agree upon some means for conceding greater power to the general government. In September of the same year, as the result of a conference of commissioners from the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland (three of which were then slave States), a call was issued for a Constitutional convention. This convention assembled in Philadelphia and finally adopted a framework of government, which received the approval of the people. Subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution, some ten conciliatory amendments were appended to it.

I have thus hastily reviewed the more prominent features of our early

governmental history with reference to the steps taken from time to time to secure the liberty of the citizens by centralizing power in the hands of the general government.

In making this demand for the ballot as secured by the United States, we women have frequently been met with this objection, "It is centralization, and centralization tends to destroy liberty." I acknowledge, gentlemen, that an indiscriminate centralization of power does tend to destroy liberty; but, on the other hand, a wise and judicious centralization of certain powers of government is not only promotive of, but absolutely essential to, the maintenance and perpetuation of liberty. The accumulation of the powers of a State in the hands of the legislature of a State, by which that body is given the exclusive control of all State affairs even down to the building of a bridge or the location of a village cemetery, is one phase of that centralization which is dangerous to liberty. To such an extent has this policy been carried that in many of the States, steps have been taken to curtail or restrict the State government and to give the county and town authorities the control of their own local affairs. With respect to all such matters, we women believe in a diffusion of the powers of government. We appreciate the fact that, as power becomes more diffused in that way, in connection with these minor matters, liberty is more fully established.

In regard to general governmental matters, such as the exercise of the suffrage by citizens of the United States, we know that in the steps it has taken in that direction the general government, as I have shown you, has promoted the liberty of the citizen and better secured it by the exercise of its protecting power over the ballot.

Following the adoption of the Constitution and the ten amendments of which I have spoken, other steps were taken to centralize power in the general government because of the necessity which seemed to be felt at the time for the enforcement of this policy. In the latter part of the eighteenth century, the XIth amendment to the Constitution (pertaining to the judiciary) was adopted, and in the early part of the nineteenth century, the XIIth amendment (regulating the election of President and Vice-President by electors), in regard to which I believe a bill for a change in the method is now pending before the House, was adopted. An interval of some years elapsed before this necessity for a more complete centralization of power in the general management again manifested itself. It did present itself to the attention of the people of the country upon the breaking out of the war of the Rebellion, when the XIIIth amendment was adopted, and afterwards the XIVth and XVth amendments, all of them seeming to be in the interest of liberty.

Here permit me to digress for a moment in order to notice an objection that we have sometimes encountered, and one that was urged when Mrs. Minor's case came before the Supreme Court of the United States. It found expression in the declaration of Chief Justice Waite when he declared that the United States had no voters. I assert that those who exercise the suffrage are in a certain sense voters of the United States as distinguished from the voters of the States. I claim, and shall endeavor to show you in the course of my remarks, that the power over the ballot which has been relinquished by the several States has been voluntarily relinquished to the general government, in the course of time, as the States have become consolidated into one harmonious whole. The XIVth amendment declared that all persons born and naturalized in the United States or in the several States are citizens of the State in which they reside. Then the XVth amendment was passed securing to all men

the right to vote without regard to color. The purpose and effect of those amendments was to centralize this power, so far as regards the colored men, in the hands of the United States. In other words, the general government made those colored men United States voters, as those amendments completely overrode all State provisions. The States which had denied to colored men the right to vote could not longer withhold the suffrage from them after those amendments went into effect. In the State of New York, from which I come, for instance, prior to the ratification of those amendments, no colored man was allowed to vote unless he had a property qualification of $250, but immediately after the ratification of those amendments the State statute on that subject became a dead letter; and, although it remained for a time on the statute books of the State, these colored men were admitted to vote irrespective of the property qualification. I ask therefore, gentlemen, were they not United States voters?

We now ask, at the hands of Congress, the passage of the XVIth amendment. We ask this in the interest of liberty, not only because we seek for our own, but because we would have you preserve your liberty. We base our demand upon the broadest considerations. According to the argument of our opponents, we have this great anomaly in governmental history, that the underlying principle of a goverment which was founded, as was our own, upon the basis of individual rights, upon the right of every person to self government (which rights in this country are only exercised by and through the ballot), that this fundamental principle has been left for 100 years in the hands of the States individually, and should continue there. I answer that you have taken from the States the power to fix State boundaries, to coin money, to establish post-routes, to declare peace or war, to collect revenues, to regulate commerce, and such like powers; and, in the greater interest of the liberties of the people, you have centralized these powers in the United States Government. Under the amendments to the Constitution, it is only the black man who is secure in his right to vote in the States. White men are not more secure in that right than are we women; and I submit that this theory of government which admits that the States severally have entire jurisdiction over the ballot is a most dangerous one. This power is shown most dangerously in those States which have prohibited women from holding the ballot and declared that males only should exercise it. It is against this that we women protest when we declare that the ballot should be based only on citizenship. We desire that citizenship and suffrage in the United States should be practically synonymous terms. Under such an interpretation of the meaning of the terms, we would be willing to leave the regulation of the suffrage in the hands of the States. I, for one, would not take from the States any power which belongs to them; I only ask that what shall be done shall be done exactly in the line of all that has been done since the beginning of our government for the purpose of more fully securing the liberty of all citizens of the United States, of enabling the people of the States more fully to preserve their political dignity, while permitting them to regulate the suffrage on conditions equally applicable to all persons. This is what is meant by the language of the form of amendment here submitted: and in asking this, I repeat, we are asking for the security of your liberty as well as our own.

Furthermore, under the amendments to the Constitution, the condition of male citizens is this: Any white man may be disfranchised by a State law but no colored man can be thus disfranchised; the colored man is secure while the white man is not secure in the exercise of the suffrage;

and the security of the colored man depends not upon any statutes of the States but solely upon the assurance afforded by the United States in the amendments to which I have referred.

Those of you, gentlemen, who are advocates of the State rights doctrine need entertain no apprehension that we contemplate any violation of that doctrine in the position we have assumed here, because an amendment to the Constitution such as we propose cannot be ratified, and therefore cannot be made affective, without the consent of two-thirds of the States. When Miss Anthony, in her argument before the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday, asked the chairman (Senator Thurman) whether that was not in strict accordance with the States rights principle, that gentleman answered that it was.

As I was saying, the States, at all times in the past, when they have given up a portion of their liberties in the interest of the general government, have given them up in the interest of all the States, and, in so doing, have secured their own liberty more fully. We know, too, that in proportion as the right of the ballot is nationalized, as it is made broader, as it is made more secure to citizens of the United States, the more it is permanently secured. We know, too, that our country has reached a period in its history when the attention of the people of the country is directed most earnestly and anxiously to what shall be the condition of the republic. We are convinced that this suffrage question has assumed a larger and wider scope and is of more profound interest at this time than at any time heretofore; that it is rapidly becoming a feature of the national policy; and that, since the war, the demand for woman suffrage has extended over the whole country. We desire to remind you, gentlemen, that by passing the XVIth amendment you will not only be securing to yourselves the rights of individual self government and making yourselves more secure in the exercise of those rights, but that you will be following directly in the line which our country has followed from the meeting of the first American Congress up to this day. With these remarks, I leave this portion of the question with you.

[Here the time expired.]

## REMARKS OF MISS PHŒBE W. COUZINS, OF MISSOURI.

Miss COUZINS (to whom had been assigned the next thirty minutes) came forward and said:

*Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee:* I am invited to speak of the dangers which beset us at this hour in the recent decision by the United States Supreme Court in the case of Mrs. Minor. Coming, as I do, from the State of Missouri, it has been deemed best that I should review this case more fully before you than has been done by the speakers who have preceded me.

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Mrs. Minor's case not only stultifies its previous interpretation of the recent Constitutional amendments and makes them a dead letter, but will rank, in the coming ages, in the history of the judiciary, with the Dred Scott decision. The law, as explained in the Dred Scott case, was an infamous one, which trampled upon the most solemn rights of the loyal citizens of the government, and declared the Constitution to mean anything or nothing, as the case might be. Yet, the decision in that case had a saving clause, for it was not the unanimous voice of a Democratic judiciary. Dissenting opinions were nobly uttered from the bench. In the more recent case, under the rule of a Republican judiciary (created by a

party professing to be one of justice and equal rights,) the rights of one-half of the people were deliberately abrogated without a dissenting voice. This violation of the fundamental principles of our government called forth no protest from the bench of a Republican judiciary. In all of the decisions against woman in the Republican court, there has not been found one Lord Mansfield who, rising to the supreme height of an unbiased judgment, would give the immortal decree that shall crown with regal dignity the mother of the race: "I care not for the supposed dictates of judges, however eminent, if they be contrary to principle. If the parties will have judgment, let justice be done, though the Heavens fall."

The Dred Scott decision declared as the law of citizenship, "to be a citizen is to have actual possession and enjoyment or the perfect right to the acquisition and an enjoyment of an entire equality of privileges, civil and political." But the slave power was then dominant and the court decided that a black man was not a citizen because he had not the right to vote. But when the Constitution was so amended as to make "all persons born or naturalized in the United States citizens thereof," a negro, by virtue of his United States citizenship, was declared, under the amendments, a voter in every State in the Union. And the Supreme Court reaffirmed this right in the celebrated Slaughter-house cases (16 Wallace, 71), reaffirming the negro's right. It said, "The negro, having by the XIVth amendment, been declared to be a citizen of the United States, is thus made a voter in every State in the Union."

But when the loyal women of Missouri, apprehending that "everybody beneath the flag were made citizens and voters by the XIVth amendment," through Mrs. Minor, applied to the Supreme Court for protection in the exercise of that same right, this high tribunal, reversing all its former decisions, proclaims State sovereignty superior to national authority. This it does in this strange language: "Being born in the United States, a woman is a person and therefore a citizen"—we are much obliged to them for that definition of our identity as persons—"but the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one." And then, in the face of its previous decisions, the court declared: "The United States has no voters in the States of its own creation;" that the elective officers of the United States are all elected, directly or indirectly, by State voters. It remands woman to the States for her protection, thus giving to the State the supreme authority and overthrowing the entire results of the war, which was fought to maintain the national supremacy over any and all subjects in which the rights and privileges of the citizens of the United States are involved.

No supreme allegiance, gentlemen of the committee, can be claimed for or by a government if it has no citizens of its own creation, and constitutional amendments cannot confer authority over matters which have no existence in the Constitution. Thus, our supreme law givers hold themselves up for obloquy and ridicule in their interpretation of the most solemn rights of loyal citizens, and make our constitutional law to mean anything or nothing as the case may be. You will see, gentlemen, that the very point which the South contended for as the true one is here acknowledged to be the true one by the Supreme Court—that of State rights superior to national authority. The whole of the recent contest hinged upon this. The appeal to arms and the constitutional amendments by the government were to establish the subordination of the State to national supremacy, to maintain the national authority over any and all subjects in which the rights and privileges of the citizens of the United States were involved; but this decision in Mrs. Minor's case completely nulli-

fies the supreme authority of the government, and gives the South more than has hitherto been claimed for it by the advocates of State rights. The subject of the franchise is thus wholly withdrawn from federal supervision and control. If "the United States has no citizens of its own creation," of course no supreme allegiance can be claimed by it over the various citizens of the States.

The constitutional amendments also cannot confer authority over a matter which has no existence in the Constitution. If it has no voters, it can have nothing whatever to do with the elections and voting in the States; yet the United States invaded the State of New York, sent its officers there to try, convict, and sentence Miss Anthony for exercising a right in her own State which they declared that the United States had no jurisdiction over. They send United States troops into the South to protect the negro in his right to vote, and then declare they have no jurisdiction over his voting. Then, mark the grave results which may and can follow this decision and legislation. I do not imagine that the Supreme Court, in its cowardly dodging of woman's right to all the rights and privileges which citizenship involves, designed to completely abrogate the principles established by the recent contest, or to nullify the ensuing legislation on the subject. But it certainly has done all this; for it must logically follow that if the United States has no citizens, it cannot legislate upon the rights of citizens, and the recent amendments are devoid of authority. It has well been suggested by Mr. Minor, in his criticism of the decision, that if members of the House of Representatives are elected by *State* voters, as the Supreme Court has thus declared, there is no reason why States may not refuse to elect them as in 1860, and thus deprive Congress of its power. And if a sufficient number could be united to recall at their pleasure these Representatives, what authority has the Federal Government, under this decision, for coercing them into subjection or refusing them a separation, if all these voters in the States desired an independent existence? None whatever.

Mr. Garfield, in the House, in his speech last March, calls attention to this grave subject, but does not allude to the fact that the Supreme Court has already opened the door. He says: 'There are several ways in which our government may be annihilated without the firing of a gun. For example, suppose the people of the United States should say, we will elect no Representatives to Congress. Of course this is a violent supposition; but suppose that they do not. Is there any remedy? Does our Constitution provide any remedy whatever? In two years there would be no House of Representatives; of course, no support of the government and no government. Suppose, again, the States should say, through their legislatures, we will elect no Senators. Such abstention alone would absolutely destroy this government; and our system provides no process of compulsion to prevent it. Again, suppose the two houses were assembled in their usual order, and a majority of one in this body or in the Senate should firmly band themselves together and say, we will vote to adjourn the moment the hour of meeting arrives, and continue so to vote at every session during our two years of existence—the government would perish, and there is no provision of the Constitution to prevent it." The States may inform their Representatives that they can do this; and, under this position, they have the power and the right so to do.

Gentlemen, we are now on the verge of one of the most important Presidential campaigns. The party in power holds its reins by a very uncertain tenure. If the decision shall favor the one which has been

on the anxious bench for lo! these twenty years, and in probation until hope has well-nigh departed, what may be its action if invested again with the control of the destinies of this nation? Under the decision of which I have spoken, the Republican judiciary and legislation have placed in the hands of that party a club which can break in pieces their political bonds and scatter the illogical brains of their adversaries to the four winds. Hurling back at the party which has so long dominated over it the principle which the Republican party has everywhere bombastically enunciated, it may cause that party to realize that there is a vast difference as to whose ox it is that is gored in the coming political pasture. The next party in power may inquire, and answer, by what right and how far the Southern States are bound by the legislation in which they had no part or consent. And if the Supreme Court of a Republican judiciary now declares, *after* the war, *after* the constitutional amendments, that federal suffrage does not exist and never had an existence in the Constitution, it follows that the South has the right to regulate and control all of the questions arising upon suffrage in the several States without any interference on the part of an authority which declares it has no jurisdiction.

Gentlemen, an able writer has said, "All injustice at last works out a loss. The great ledger of nations does not report a good balance for injustice. It has always met fearful losses. The irrepealable law of justice will, sooner or later, grind a nation to powder, if it fails to establish that equilibrium of allegiance and protection which is the essential end of all government. Woe to that nation which thinks lightly of the duties it owes to its citizens and imagines that governments are not bound by moral laws."

It was the tax on tea—woman's drink prerogative—which precipitated the rebellion of 1776. To allay the irritation of the colonies, all taxes were rescinded save that on tea, which was left to indicate King George's dominion. But our revolutionary fathers and mothers said, "No; the tax is paltry, but the principle is great;" and Eve, as usual, pointed the moral for Adam's benefit. A most suggestive picture, one which aroused the intensest patriotism of the colonies (and it is one which may, perhaps, accompany the typical snake-form of which Mrs. Gage has spoken to you), was that of a woman pinioned by her arms to the ground by a British peer, with a British red-coat holding her throat with one hand, and with the other forcibly thrusting down her throat the contents of a tea-pot, which she heroically spewed back in his face; while the figure of Justice, in the distance, with veiled face, wept over this prostrate Liberty. Now, gentlemen, we might well adopt a similar representation as indicative of our own prostrate liberty. Here is Mrs. Smith [referring to Mrs. Julia Smith, of Glastonbury, Conn.], whose cow has been sold every year by the government, contending for the same principle that our forefathers fought for, that of resistance to taxation without representation. We might have a picture of a cow, with an American tax-collector at the horns, a foreign-born assessor at the heels, forcibly selling the birthright of an American citizen, while Julia and Abby Smith, in the background, with veiled faces, weep over the degeneracy of Republican leadership.

The same tyrannical spirit of King George is manifest to-day. The rights of every citizen, save of women, are now jealously guarded and freely recognized. Royalty, on Capitol Hill, in complaisant security, with its scepter in the White House and its throne in Justice's Hall, shouts, "The king is dead," and yet we must say, "Long live the king." But, forever and aye, uneasy is the head that wears a crown; and disguised Indians—(one lady has said that we were not Indians; but we may

be Indians, gentlemen, and may yet take some scalps on Capitol Hill)—disguised Indians may yet proclaim wrecked ships for that royalty which dares to sail upon the main with autocratic powers.

But there are those in authority in the government who do not believe in this decision that has been made by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Attorney-General, in his instructions to the United States marshals and their deputies or assistants in the Southern States, when speaking of the countenance and support of all good citizens of the United States in the respective districts of the marshals, remarks: "It is not necessary to say that it is upon such countenance and support that the United States mainly rely in their endeavor to enforce the right to vote which they have given or have secured." You notice the phraseology. Again, he says: "The laws of the United States are supreme, and so, consequently, is the action of officials of the United States in enforcing them." Secretary Sherman said, in his speech at Steubenville on the 6th of July: "The negroes are free, and are citizens and voters. That, at least, is a part of the Constitution and cannot be changed." Mr. Hayes has been quoted here. In his last message he has quoted the same expression which he made use of in a former message. He says: "I find no reason to qualify the opinion I expressed in my last annual message, that no temporary or administrative interests of government will ever displace the zeal of our people in defense of the primary rights of citizenship, and that the power of public opinion will override all political prejudices and all sectional and State attachments in demanding that all over our wide territory the name and character of citizen of the United States shall mean one and the same thing, and carry with them unchallenged security and respect."

And this is what we ask of you this morning, "that citizenship shall mean one and the same thing" for us, women.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I say to you that a sense of justice is the sovereign power of the human mind, the most unyielding of any; it rewards with a higher sanction, it punishes with a deeper agony than any earthly tribunal. It never slumbers, never dies. It constantly utters and demands justice by the eternal rule of right, truth, and equity. And on these eternal foundation stones we stand.

Crowning the dome of this great building (which was erected, as Mrs. Gage has so beautifully and so truthfully said, by the taxes of the women of the United States), there stands the majestic figure of a woman representing Liberty. It was no idealistic thought or accident of vision which gave us Liberty prefigured by a woman. It is the great soul of the universe pointing the final revelation yet to come to humanity, the prophecy of the ages—the last to be first. Not more certain than that upon the dome of the Capitol stands the majestic figure of a woman, representing all that is grand and noble and free in self-government, is it that in the great hereafter there shall come the exaltation of a glorious womanhood, coming up out of the wilderness of the past, clear as the sun, fair as the moon, powerful in her righteousness as an army with banners; and that humanity, from the East and the West, and the North and the South, sitting at her feet, shall learn that Freedom from its loftiest heights is Liberty in Woman.

[Here the time expired.]

### REMARKS OF MISS SUSAN B. ANTHONY OF NEW YORK.

At this point the time allotted for the hearing having expired, the chairman *protem* announced an extension of thirty minutes to allow Miss Anthony to address the committee.

She said:

*Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee:* I did not propose to

make any argument, but simply to call the attention of the committee to the fact that disfranchisement is not only political degradation, but that it is also social, moral, and industrial degradation. It does not matter whether the class affected by disfranchisement is that of ignorant, intemperate, or vicious men—the serfs in Russia, the negroes on our plantations before the war, the Chinamen on our Pacific coast to-day—or the intelligent, educated women of this Republic, disfranchisement works precisely the same results. If we could make the men and women of this republic realize for a moment that the results of disfranchisement to woman are the same as the results of disfranchisement to all the different classes of men I have named, we should not have to wait for another Congress before the proposition for a XVITH amendment would be submitted. But the difficulty is that each man to whom we appeal fails to appreciate the consequences of this law of disfranchisement or to realize the degradation which it entails. I have endeavored, in my arguments, to show that disfranchisement is the cause of woman's degradation in the world of labor; that it is because of it that she is doomed, everywhere doomed, to remain in the subordinate departments of labor, in the school-house, everywhere; that she is doomed to do her work for half pay, always as a subordinate, as I have said, and without any promotion. If men could only believe that the fact of that position of woman in the world of work was due to her disfranchisement, we should not have one session of Congress pass without a proposition for an amendment. But the people do not believe it; and yet, as some of the ladies have shown here, it is the cause of woman's degradation in labor everywhere. We are here to ask that woman may have the power of the ballot; that when she speaks she shall be respected; that when women workers in the factories and shops, the teachers in the school-houses, shall combine together to demand better wages of the capitalists; the political editors of the newspapers in a community will feel that if they speak on the side of the capitalist and against the workingwomen their party will lose the votes of those workingwomen at the next election. With the ballot in the hands of all the millions of factory women and workingwomen in this nation, you can perceive at once that they have a power by which they, like the workmen of the nation, can decide what work they will do, what prices they will be paid, and what positions they will occupy. Then, as to the government departments of which some one here has spoken, the facts are that all over the country there are hundreds of thousands of civil service offices; that many of the women of this republic are well qualified to do the work in those departments, but stand very little chance to get a fair quota of those appointments at the hands of members of Congress, members of the state legislatures, and "the powers that be" everywhere—this, not because men are unjust, not because many of the members of Congress here at Washington would not be glad to have women appointed to the various positions of work, but because it is an utter impossibility, politically speaking, for them to secure places. Governments cannot afford to give good places, good work, or good offices to persons who cannot help to make government. So long as woman holds in her hands no power to help make this government, no member of Congress can afford to advocate equal pay and equal place for women in the departments. The best of our friends, as members of this committee, know that, on the floor of Congress, when we have asked them to ordain that women workers shall be paid equal wages with men, they have told us that to pass such a law, and enforce it, would be to drive all the women out of the departments, because the only excuse that

the government now has for employing them is that it is a matter of economy to the government. Now, what we ask is that women shall have this power of appeal to the self-interest of the government office-holders and the government itself. We ask that woman shall have the ballot that she may come within the body-politic, and there become joint heir with her brothers for all the good things that are to be disposed of at the hands of the government.

This disfranchisement is not only an industrial and a social, but a moral degradation. Why, gentlemen of the committee, did you every stop to think of what disfranchisement says to each and every one of these women here to-day and to each and every one of the women under this proud flag? It says, *non compos*, your judgment is not sound, your opinions are not worthy to be counted up in what men call "public sentiment," "the crystallizing of the popular will into law." While that is true of all women, let me put before you the other side. Enfranchisement says to every man, poor or rich, ignorant or learned, drunk or sober—to every man outside the State's prison or the lunatic asylum—"your judgment is sound, your opinion is worthy to be counted." And you gentlemen, all of you, recognize the fact that the equal counting and equal recognition of men's opinions establishes in this country that good thing which we call "political equality"—each and every man equal to each and every other man. The opinion of the most ignorant ditch-digger in the country, on election day, counts for just as much as that of the richest and proudest millionaire. It is a good thing, gentlemen; and we, women suffragists, believe in the principle of democracy and republicanism, in the equal recognition of all men; but while that principle establishes the equal and just recognition of all men among men, we at the same time recognize that it establishes between the sexes that hateful thing of inequality; that it makes all men sovereigns and all women subjects; that it makes all men, politically, superiors and all women inferiors. And there is no amount of training, education, or discipline that can ever educate an ignorant man or a small boy to the belief that that is not the discrimination. This ignoring of women's opinions politically is not grounded upon intellectual inferiority. The more ignorant the man the better he feels convinced that he knows more than the most intelligent woman in the country. Intelligent men know that the great work of this republic from the beginning has been the sloughing off, little by little, of the old feudalistic ideas of caste, until at last we have this grand idea of self-government. We women know that those who are engaged in this movement are struggling with might and main to lift the women, through the XVIth amendment, upon the same platform with intelligent, cultivated man, who does respect an intelligent, cultivated woman, whom the ignorant man does not comprehend and has no appreciation of.

I will give you an illustration of my meaning. There are three ladies in this room to-day from the State of Iowa. One of those ladies pays more taxes in the city of Maquoketa, in which she resides, than do the whole twelve men who are the members of the common council of her city. Those three women, in the city of Maquoketa, and county of Jackson, have been at the very head and front of the Women's Christian Temperance organization in that city. They have prayed, petitioned, and done everything to shut up the grog-shops in their community which a disfranchised class can do—which is exactly nothing. On election morning, the question of license or no license is to be voted on in that city. My friend, Mrs. Allen, and other ladies who work with her have paid into the treasury of the county of Jackson no small amount of taxes for the support of the victims of the idiocy and crime which are the outgrowth of

the liquor traffic. My friend, Mrs. Allen, is standing on the street on election morning, and in another quarter there stands an ignorant man, a man who by his drunkenness has caused to be sold under the hammer the farm he inherited from his father, whose every dollar of property is gone, whose wife and children are houseless and homeless and he a pauper in the county house, supported at the public expense. He knows that three-fourths of the money taken from Mrs. Allen's and those other ladies' taxes goes to support him and others like him in his and their necessities. He looks at that woman; he sneers at her education, her standing, her fine clothes, her self-respect, at everything she possesses; he envies her; but at last he bethinks himself. He folds his arms and with utter complacency exclaims, "Yez can sing, yez can shout, yez can pray, yez can petition agin rum; but, *be jabers*, *yez* can't go to the ballot-box and vote agin it. I can vote for free whisky and you can't help yourselves." Now, gentlemen of the committee, do you not see how that little fact, that that ignorant pauper's opinion is thus respected and counted that day, while that intelligent tax-paying woman's opinion is ignored, educates that ignoramus into a feeling of superiority over that woman? Nothing but an amendment of the Constitution of the United States, saying that that woman's opinion shall be respected and counted, will ever educate that man to respect her. The secret, underlying cause of the disrespect which men often show toward women—the slighting manner in which coarse, rude men are wont to speak of woman—lies in the fact of woman's opinion being ignored in the deciding of all the great questions involving the conditions or surroundings of society and the government.

Then look at the boys of this generation. Before the boy's head reaches the level of the table, he learns that he is one of the superior class and that when he is twenty-one years old he will make laws for Mrs. Saxon, Mrs. Gage, and all these ladies who are mothers. His mother teaches him all the requisites for success in after life. She says: "My son, you must not chew, nor smoke, nor gamble, nor swear, nor be a libertine; you must be a good man." The boy looks his mother in the face, unbelievingly, and, perchance, at his father, who is guilty of every one of the vices which the mother says he must avoid if he would become a great man. Perhaps he sees the minister of his mother's church walking the street with a cigar in his mouth. Then he looks to Congress. It may have been a slander—nevertheless it was a newspaper report, and I use it as an illustration—that the Forty-fifth Congress, at its close, had but one sober man on its floor, and he was a black man (Cain) of South Carolina. I do not say that that was true, but I give it as I heard it. If the boy goes into court, he sees the judge, with a good-sized spittoon by his side and half filled. Now, what does the boy say when he looks up to his mother? He says, "O, nonsense! mother, you don't know what you are talking about; you're only a woman."

If you would have that boy respect his mother, your laws will first have to respect her. Laws do more to educate and develop public sentiment than you, whose business it is to make laws and constitutions, are doing to-day. Therefore, as a matter of educating ignorant men and small boys in a just and respectful appreciation of woman, I ask you not to bury this petition of ours, but to do something to awaken an agitation and discussion of our request on the floors of Congress.

Allow me to make one further observation. Since the days of Frémont and Jessie, women have been very politely invited to attend Republican meetings. All of you Republicans know how the women filled up your empty benches in those days and made your conventions

look very respectable indeed. By and by the Democrats came into line, and the conventions of both parties often contained as many women as men. Then the poor stump orators are put to their wit's end upon the woman question. They can, without difficulty, frame paragraphs to suit every class of human beings who have a ballot; they can appeal alike to the rumsellers and the temperance men, to the Irishmen, the Germans, the Swedes, the Bohemians and, since the XVth amendment, to the negroes. Every politician can promptly show why his own party is the one for which the particular class to which he addresses himself should vote. Finally he comes to the inevitable woman and, realizing that he must say something on that point, says: "I am glad to see the ladies here to-night, am always glad to have them in my audiences; they are a sort of inspiration, enable me to make a better speech: the fact is, gentlemen, I rather like the ladies, for my mother was a woman—God bless her." Now, gentlemen, don't you believe that if under those bonnets there were voters, those voters would soon cause that orator and his party, whether in or out of power, to suddenly discover there were some brains under there? You see that we want this power to appeal to the instinct of self-interest in this government; and if this committee does not do itself the honor to report a proposition for a XVIth amendment, some succeeding committee will do itself that honor. The tide is moving, it cannot be swept back. I beg you, in the name of justice, humanity, and mercy, that you will not keep woman coming back here for the next thirty years as she has been kept coming here for the last thirty years.

I hope too, that you will help us all you can. We, who are agitating this movement, are not a moneyed class. I trust that you will submit a resolution directing that the reports of this hearing shall be printed at the government expense. I would also urge the importance of your presenting the proposition for a XVIth Amendment before Congress because it will create an agitation and discussion which may educate not only the members of Congress but their constituencies on this question.

Mr. LAPHAM, of New York. I have understood that your association desired to have an act of incorporation.

Miss ANTHONY. It is true that we desire incorporation. When the rich Miss Dorseys and others all over the country take it into their heads to make us a bequest, we should be in a condition to hold any such bequest according to law. We have framed a bill looking to the chartering of our organization that we may become a legal personage, and I ask of you to give the measure whatever of aid you may be able to give it.

Mrs. SARA A. SPENCER of Washington, D. C. I desire to thank the committee for their courtesy to the women of the United States as represented here by delegates from twenty-two States. It was in answer to my urgent appeal in behalf of our association that the committee granted this hearing. All the delegates desired to be heard; but for the convenience of the committee, the brief time was apportioned among those who represented different sections of the country and different phases of our question. I would now ask you, gentlemen, to print the record we have made, that it may come before the 376 members of Congress. We can expect this only by your courtesy but, as you have printed 10,000 copies of a memorial service held over a dead man, we ask you to print a like number of copies of an argument in behalf of ten millions of living women citizens.

At this point, the hearing having been concluded, the committee adjourned.

○